



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*PS*  
*A-T*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/470,650    12/22/99    FIGURA

T    94-0280.04

CHARLES BRANTLEY  
MICRON TECHNOLOGY INC  
8000 S FEDERAL WAY  
MAIL STOP 525  
BOISE ID 83716

MMC1/0806

EXAMINER
----------

KILDAY, L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2813

DATE MAILED:

08/06/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/470,650

Applicant(s)

FIGURA ET AL.

Examiner

Lisa A Kilday

Art Unit

2813

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8,10-14,19,23,24,29-32 and 36-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8,10-14,19,23,24,29-32 and 36-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3, 4, 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 36-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. The term "environment" in claim 36 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "environment" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The examiner has broadly interpreted environment to mean temperature, apparatus, or chamber.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-8, 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujita et al. (5,084,413). Fujita et al. discloses forming an oxide layer (14) on a silicon substrate (10), and forming a contact hole (16) in the oxide. Fujita et al. discloses depositing a poly layer (18) in the hole by CVD and depositing a polymer resist (22) over the poly and in the hole. The polymer layer is then dry etched back and the poly is

Art Unit: 2813

etched using the polymer mask. The resist is then removed (fig. 2-7, col. 2 lines 45-col. 3 line 42).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-8,10-14,19,23,24,29-32 and 36-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita et al. (5,048,413) as applied to claims 1-8, 10-14 above, and further in view of Numata et al. (4,759,958) and Zenke (5,441,594) or alternatively Numata et al. (4,759,958) and Wang et al. (5,354,715). Fujita et al. discloses forming an oxide layer (14) on a silicon substrate (10), and forming a contact hole (16) in the oxide. Fujita et al. discloses depositing a poly layer (18) in the hole by CVD and depositing a polymer resist (22) over the poly and in the hole. The polymer layer is then dry etched back and the poly is etched using the polymer mask. The resist is then removed.

4. Numata et al. teach CVD formation of a polyimide layer. Zenke is cited to provide motivation generally to deposit and etchback polymer in the same chamber (abstract, col. 4 lines 60-65), (Wang et al. abstract, col. 20 lines 21-33). It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to deposit and etchback a polymer material in the same chamber due to the reduced processing time and reduced contamination. Wang et al. teaches equipment settings and deposition conditions that overlap the applicant's ranges (claims

Art Unit: 2813

1, 10-13). The range of equipment settings and deposition conditions are well known in the art.

### ***Double Patenting***

5. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

6. Claims 9, 13, 23-24, 29, 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-2, 6, 10, 13 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,117,764. This is a double patenting rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Lisa Kilday whose telephone number is (703) 306-5728. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Bowers, can be reached on (703) 308-2417. The fax phone number for the group is (703) 305-3432.



Charles Bowers  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2800

LAK